



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,544	11/24/2003	Hung-Yang Chang	YOR920030493US1	1272
30743 7590 07/24/2008 WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190				
EXAMINER RICEK, JASON D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2142				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,544

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL.

Examiner

JASON RECEK

Art Unit

2142

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 10, 14 and 20-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 10, 14 and 20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI-108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the amendment and RCE filed on April 16th 2008 which concern application 10/718544.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-3, 9 and 15-19 have been cancelled per applicant's request.

Claims 8, 10, 14 and 20-23 are pending.

Claims 8, 10, 14 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 16th 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 4/16/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Ruths does not disclose "enabling a user ... to perform at least one of adding, editing, and deleting a collaboration member in the collaboration space, said collaboration space containing at least one of a role player and a discussion thread" as recited by claim 8. This argument is not persuasive. Ruths teaches a collaboration system that has many features. One of these features is management (paragraph 80). Specifically, Ruths teaches that participants are controlled through the use of authentication (paragraph 139) and that connection IDs may be added and removed (adding, editing, and deleting a collaboration member) and that participants may be chosen (paragraph 151). Furthermore Ruths discloses an example of a classroom collaboration environment (paragraph 138), such an environment would necessarily contain roles, at least a student and a teacher (collaboration space containing at least ... a role player). Even if applicant disagrees whether Ruths discloses roles, the claim does not require a role player since it uses the term "at least one of ... " and Danso is cited as teaching a discussion thread (see below). For these reasons, applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Applicant also argues that Ruths does not teach "allowing a first user to communicate with one or more other users and to gain access to resources in the context said first user is working in without said first user having to leave said first user's development environment and without said first user having to switch to a different

collaboration application" as recited by claim 8. This argument is also not persuasive. Ruths teaches allowing a user to communicate with another user, specifically by using VOIP (paragraph 137). There is no disclosure in Ruth that would indicate this cannot be done without switching applications or windows. In fact the disclosure of Ruths suggests exactly what the claim recites, that a user would be able to talk simultaneously while viewing and working with resources in the collaboration environment (paragraph 137).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 8, 10, 14 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruths et al. US 2003/0018719 A1 in view of Danso US 2003/0167344 A1.

Regarding claim 8, Ruths discloses "performing at least one of creating a context ... adding a resource and a relationship ... deleting a resource and a relationship" as a collaborative platform which creates collaborative environments and manages data objects (paragraph 49), "enabling a user to create a collaboration space" as entering into collaborative groups (paragraph 85), "to associate the collaboration space with a

context" as a participant may use the collaboration for multiple purposes (paragraph 85), "to perform at least one of adding, editing, and deleting a collaboration member" as adding and removing connection IDs (paragraph 151), "said collaboration space containing at least one of a role player" as a classroom environment would necessarily have roles (paragraph 138), "capturing a user action in a development environment and determining a context associated with said user action" as capturing changes to data and updating changes to participants (paragraph 88), "displaying in a graphical user interface window content of a collaboration space" (paragraph 52), and "allowing a first user to communicate with one or more other users and to gain access to resources in the context said first user is working in without said first user having to leave said first user's development environment and without said first user having to switch to a different collaboration application" as a user communicating with another user via VOIP during collaboration (paragraph 137).

Ruths does not explicitly disclose "said collaboration space containing at least one of ... a discussion thread" or "said current developer context including at least one of ... online status, e-meeting links, and discussion threads". One of ordinary skill in the art would understand Ruths to teach that while collaborating interactively (paragraph 138) online status would be inherent (communication would indicate that a participant is online) however a discussion thread would not necessarily occur in Ruths. These features can be clearly found in Danso US 2003/0167344 A1. Danso teaches that collaboration includes discussions and forums (paragraph 81).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ruths with the teachings of Danso for the purpose of collaboration. Using forums (discussion thread) to collaborate is well known in the art (as evidenced by Danso) and yields predictable results. Such an improvement is nothing more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established function.

Regarding claim 10, Ruths discloses "a collaboration plugin to an integrated development environment that provides a user with tools for use in the development environment" as the collaboration platform allows existing applications to become collaborative (paragraphs 53-54) and "there being a collaboration plugin for each user workstation" as the platform may be implemented as a plug-in on each participant device (paragraph 59).

Regarding claim 14, Ruths discloses "managing a life cycle of one or more collaboration spaces" as a collaboration platform that allows a user to participate in collaboration (paragraph 57), "directing collaborative operations to external collaboration servers" as sending commands to a server that has the collaborative data (paragraphs 58, 89), and "servers including ... a team room server" as a classroom (paragraph 138).

Regarding claim 20, Ruths discloses "allowing the user to enable and disable context sensitivity and to open a collaboration space manually" as providing an

abstraction of the resources thereby enabling different user views of the resources and allowing creation of a collaborative group (paragraph 85).

Regarding claim 21, Ruths discloses "the user action includes at least one of editing a file ..." as manipulating data (paragraph 52).

Regarding claim 22, Ruths discloses "said context is a project" as collaboration on a task (paragraph 49).

Regarding claim 23, Ruths discloses "managing the life cycle of collaboration spaces" as a collaboration platform that performs management functions (paragraph 80) and allows a user to participate in collaboration session (paragraph 57).

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Amado et al. US 2003/0220905 A1 explicitly discloses collaboration using roles (paragraph 24).

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON RECEK whose telephone number is (571)270-1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Recek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2142

(571)-270-1975

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142